

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-18 and 20-30 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 15, 18, 20 and 23-30 are amended, and claims 5 and 19 are canceled. Support for amendments to claims 1, 18 and 25 can be found at least in canceled claims 5 and 19 and paragraph [0017]. Claims 6, 15, 20, 23-25 and 27-30 are amended for form. No new matter is added.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Estremsky during the August 8 personal interview. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

I. The Claims Satisfy the Requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.126

The Office Action objects to the claims because the numbering is not in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.126. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that two claims numbered "22" are presented and misnumbered claim 22 (the second one) through 29 have been renumbered as claims 23-30, respectively. Accordingly, by this Amendment, claim 22, (the second one), through claim 29, has been renumbered as claims 23-30. Thus, the claims satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.126.

II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

A. Claims 1-7, 9-21 and 25-30

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7, 9-21 and 25-30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 3,790,197 to Parker. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 19 is canceled and thus the rejection of this claim is now moot.

Claims 1-7, 9-18, 20, 21 and 25-30 are not anticipated by Parker. As agreed during the personal interview, Parker does not disclose a rod wherein "the diameter of the first section being larger than the diameter of the second section," as recited in claim 1 and as

similarly recited in claims 18 and 25. That is, Parker does not disclose a catch plate that includes a rod, wherein the rod has a first and second section, where each section has a diameter of a cross-section taken perpendicular to direction of elongation, as shown in at least Fig. 2 of the above-identified application. Nowhere does Parker teach or suggest this feature.

Thus, claims 1, 18 and 25 are patentable over Parker. Further, claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9-17, which depend from claim 1, claims 20 and 21 which depend from claim 18, and claims 26-30, which depend from claim 25, are also patentable over Parker for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claims 1, 18 and 25, as well as the additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

B. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 13-15, 18, 24 and 25

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 13-15, 18, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 2,471,634 to Mark. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 5 is canceled and thus the rejection of this claim is now moot.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 13-15, 18, 24 and 25 are not anticipated by Mark. As agreed during the personal interview, Mark does not disclose a rod wherein "the diameter of the first section being larger than the diameter of the second section," as recited in independent claim 1, and as similarly recited in independent claim 18. That is, Mark does not disclose a catch plate that includes a rod, wherein the rod has a first and second section, where each section has a diameter of a cross-section taken perpendicular to direction of elongation, as shown in at least Fig. 2 of the above-identified application. Nowhere does Mark teach or suggest this feature.

Thus, claims 1, 18 and 25 are patentable over Mark. Further, claims 3, 4, 7, 8, and 13-15, which depend from claim 1, and claim 24, which depends from claim 18, are also patentable over Mark for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claims 1 and 18, as

well as the additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

C. Claims 22-24

The Office Action rejects claims 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 3,790,197 to Parker in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,607,223 to Mastro. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 22-24 would not have been rendered obvious by Parker in view of Mastro. Mastro does not remedy the deficiencies of Parker discussed with respect to claim 18. Mastro is only cited by the Office Action for allegedly disclosing an electrophotographic printing machine that provides a magnetic latch to hold a panel closed. Claims 22-24 depend from claim 18. Thus, claims 22-24 are patentable over Mastro for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 18, as well as the additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/rle

Date: August 12, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
--